

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/781,800	OCHIAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ruth C. Rodriguez	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ruth C. Rodriguez, PTO. (3) _____.

(2) Robert T. Pous, Applicant's representative. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 October 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Maughan.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: . The Applicant proposed an amendment to include a limitation that "the side of the socket opposite to the cover body has a diameter greater than the diameter of the projection". This overcomes the prior art of record since Maughan discloses a socket having a diameter smaller than the diameter of the projection on the side opposite to the cover in order to retain the ball within the socket. Another suggestion was to include limitations on the groove used to retain the socket within a flange on the cover. These limitations overcome the prior art of record but additional search is required before indication of allowability.